arXiv:1203.0113v1 [cs.CC] 1 Mar 2012

On equivalence of multi-letter and multi-letter measure-many quantum finite automata

Tianrong Lin*

Dept. of Computer Science, Fukien University of Technology GM Information College,
Fuzhou 350014, China

Abstract

Multi-letter quantum finite automata (multi-letter QFAs) is a new kind of quantum automata. In this paper, we focus on the equivalence problem for multi-letter QFAs. Specifically, we show that k_1-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_1$ and k_2-letter QFA $\mathcal{A}_2$ over Σ are equivalent if and only if they are $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k$-equivalent where n_i, $i = 1, 2$, are the numbers of states in $\mathcal{A}_i$, respectively, and $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$. We also prove that the similar result holds for *multi-letter measure-many quantum finite automata* (multi-letter MM-QFAs).

Keywords: Multi-letter quantum finite automata, Measure-many multi-letter quantum finite automata, Equivalence

---

1. Introduction

Recently, the study of quantum computing has attracted many researchers [1–3]. The study of *quantum finite automata* (QFAs) which is a subfield of quantum computing, also has attracted many researchers [4–8, 11–17, 23–27, 31].

The so-called *multi-letter quantum finite automata* (multi-letter QFAs), introduced by Belovs et al. [6], is a new kind of quantum finite automata which can be viewed as a quantum extension of the so-called *one-way multihead deterministic finite automata*, proposed by Hromkovič [18]. Especially, just as

---

[*] Corresponding author.
Email address: `tianrong671@yahoo.com.cn` (Tianrong Lin)

the equivalence problem for classical automata [19–22], the equivalence problem of multi-letter QFAs is deeply studied by Qiu et al. [4, 5]. In addition, the equivalence problems for *general quantum finite automata* (gQFAs) which is originality proposed by Hirvensalo [13], the *measure-many one-way quantum finite automata* (MM-1QFAs), introduced by Kondacs a nd Watrous [8], and the *quantum sequential machines*, have been investigated by Li and Qiu [24–27]. Also, the author presented a much simpler approach to the equivalence problem of MM-1QFAs [31] and then the approach is used to dealt with the equivalence problem of *enhanced one-way quantum finite automata* (E-1QFAs) which is introduced by Nayak [15]. Except quantum finite automata, the quantum complexity also has attracted many researchers [9, 10].

In this paper, we study the equivalence problem of multi-letter QFAs with a different way which is similar to [26, 31]. Also, we extend our result for multi-letter QFAs to *multi-letter measure-many quantum finite automata* (multi-letter MM-QFAs).

Now, we first summarize our main results as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$ *be* k_i*-letter QFA,* $i = 1, 2$*. Then* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$ *are equivalent iff they are* $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k$*-equivalent, where* n_1 *and* n_2 *are the numbers of states in* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$*, respectively, and* $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$.

As mentioned before, the similar result holds also for multi-letter MM-QFAs.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, Q_{rej,i}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu, \mathcal{O})$ *be* k_i*-letter MM-QFA,* $i = 1, 2$*. Then* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$ *are equivalent iff they are* $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k$*-equivalent, where* n_1 *and* n_2 *are the numbers of states in* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$*, respectively, and* $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$.

The rest of the paper is organized in the following way: Section 2 contains some relevant definitions and notations. In Section 3, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is given. In Section 4, we discuss the case for multi-letter MM-QFAs, and Section 5 summarizes.

2. Definitions and Notations

For briefly, we would like refer the reader to [1–3] for a through treatment on the basic linear algebra and the quantum theory.

Throughout this paper, we let Σ denote the non-empty finite input alphabet, $|\Sigma|$ the cardinality of Σ, and Σ^* the set of all words over Σ, i.e., $\Sigma^* = \epsilon \cup \Sigma \cup \Sigma^2 \cup \cdots$, where ϵ is the empty word. Suppose that $\omega \in \Sigma^*$. Then, the length of ω, denoted by $|\omega|$, is defined to be the numbers of letters in ω, e.g., if $\omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$ with $x_i \in \Sigma$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $|\omega| = n$ and $|\epsilon| = 0$.

With the above notations in mind, we first state the definition of multi-letter QFAs as follows.

Definition 2.1 ([4–6]). A k-letter ($k \geq 1$) QFA $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as a quintuple

$$\mathcal{A} \quad = \quad (Q, Q_{acc}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma, \mu)$$

where Q is a set of internal states and Σ is a finite input alphabet; $Q_{acc} \subseteq Q$ is the set of accepting states; $|\psi_0\rangle$ is the initial unit state that is a superposition of the states in Q; μ is a function that assigns a unitary transition matrix U_ω on $\mathbb{C}^{|Q|}$ for each word $\omega \in (\{\Lambda\} \cup \Sigma)^k$ where $\mathbb{C}^{|Q|}$ denotes the unitary space $\text{span}\{|q\rangle | q \in Q\}$.

To operate $\mathcal{A}$, start with an input $\omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$ where $x_i \in \Sigma$, and with $\mathcal{A}$ in the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$. Then, according to the last k number of letter(s) received, $\mathcal{A}$ moves in succession into the states $|\psi_1\rangle = \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle = \mu(\Lambda^{k-2}x_1 x_2)\,|\psi_1\rangle$, $\cdots$. If $n < k$, the final state is

$$|\psi_n\rangle = \mu(\Lambda^{k-n}x_1 \cdots x_n) \cdots \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle.$$

Otherwise, the final state is

$$|\psi_n\rangle = \mu(x_{n-k+1}x_{n-k+2} \cdots x_n) \cdots \mu(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k)\mu(\Lambda x_1 \cdots x_{k-1}) \cdots \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle.$$

For convenience, we denote

$$\overline{\mu}(\omega) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} \mu(\Lambda^{k-n}\omega) \cdots \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1), & n < k; \\ \mu(x_{n-k+1} \cdots x_n) \cdots \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}x_1), & n \geq k. \end{cases}$$

for any $\omega \in \Sigma^*$. Then $|\psi_n\rangle = \overline{\mu}(\omega)|\psi_0\rangle$.

Once $\mathcal{A}$ reaches the final state, the computation stops. Let P_{acc} denote the projector on the subspace spanned by Q_{acc}, i.e., $P_{acc} = \sum_{q\in Q_{acc}} |q\rangle\langle q|$. Then, the accepting probability can be defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \quad = \quad \|P_{acc}\,\overline{\mu}(\omega)|\psi_0\rangle\|^2. \tag{1}$$

We further introduce the definition of "*diagonal sum*" (cf. [31]) for multi-letter QFAs as follows.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$ be a k_i-letter QFA, $i = 1, 2$, where $k_i \geq 1$. The diagonal sum of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$, denote by $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$, is a k-letter QFA, defined to be

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} (Q, Q_{acc}, |\vartheta\rangle, \Sigma, \mu),$$

where $\mu \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mu_1 \oplus \mu_2$, $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ and $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ with $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$ and $|\vartheta\rangle$ is an arbitrary $|Q_1| + |Q_2|$-dimension unit column vector.

Remark 2.1. By $\mu = \mu_1 \oplus \mu_2$ we mean that the function μ assigns any $\gamma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k \in \{\Sigma \cup \{\Lambda\}\}^k$ to a $|Q_1| + |Q_2|$-order unitary matrix $\mu(\gamma)$ in the following manner ($k_1 \leq k_2$ is assumed)

$$\mu(\gamma) \quad \overset{\text{def}}{=} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1(\sigma_{k-k_1+1} \cdots \sigma_k) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that $\forall \omega \in \Sigma^*$, μ defined the unitary matrix $\overline{\mu}(\omega)$ on $\mathbb{C}^{|Q_1|+|Q_2|}$ as

$$\overline{\mu}(\omega) \quad = \quad \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\mu_1}(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\mu_2}(\omega) \end{pmatrix}.$$

If we apply the strategy of "measure-many" [8] to multi-letter QFAs, then we get the so-called *multi-letter measure-many quantum finite automata* whose definition can be stated as follows.

Definition 2.3. A k-letter ($k \geq 1$) MM-QFA $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ is a 7-tuple

$$\mathcal{A} \quad = \quad (Q, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu, \mathcal{O})$$

where Q, $Q_{acc} \subseteq Q$ and $Q_{rej} \subseteq Q$ (with $Q_{acc} \cap Q_{rej} = \emptyset$) are the sets of internal states, accepting states and rejecting states, respectively; Σ is a finite input alphabet and $\# \notin \Sigma$, $\$ \notin \Sigma$ are the left and right end-marker of an input word, respectively; $|\psi_0\rangle$ is the initial unit state that is a superposition of the states in Q; μ is a function that assigns a unitary transition matrix U_ω on $\mathbb{C}^{|Q|}$ for each $\omega \in (\{\Lambda, \#, \$\} \cup \Sigma)^k$ where $\mathbb{C}^{|Q|}$ and Λ denote the unitary space span$\{|q\rangle | q \in Q\}$ and blank symbol, respectively. $\mathcal{O}$ is an observable with results in $\{a, r, g\}$ described by the projectors $P(a)$, $P(r)$ and $P(g)$, given by

$$P(a) = \sum_{q \in Q_{acc}} |q\rangle\langle q|, \qquad P(g) = \sum_{q \in Q_{non}} |q\rangle\langle q|, \qquad P(r) = \sum_{q \in Q_{rej}} |q\rangle\langle q|$$

where $Q_{non} = Q \backslash (Q_{acc} \cup Q_{rej})$.

The computing procedure of a k-letter MM-QFA is similar to that of an MM-1QFA [8]. Fed with $\# x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \$$ where $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$, $\mathcal{A}$ computes as follows: starting from $|\psi_0\rangle$, $\mu(\Lambda^{k-1}\#)$ is applied and a measurement of $\mathcal{O}$ is performed reaching a new current state. If the measurement result is 'g', then $\mu(\Lambda^{k-2}\# x_1)$ is applied and a new measurement of $\mathcal{O}$ is performed. This process continues as far as measurements yields the result 'g'. As far as the result of measurement is 'a', the computation stops and the word is accepted. If the measurement result is 'r', then the computation stops and the word is rejected. If we set

$$U(x_i) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} \mu(\Lambda^{k-1}\#), & i = 0; \\ \mu(\Lambda^{k-(i+1)}\# x_1 \cdots x_i), & 0 < i \leq k-1; \\ \mu(x_{i-(k-1)} \cdots x_i), & i > k-1 \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

then, the probability of $\mathcal{A}$ accepting the word $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$ can be defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n) \quad = \quad \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} \left\| P(a) U(x_k) \left(\prod_{i=k-1}^{0} (P(g) U(x_i)) \right) |\psi_0\rangle \right\|^2 \tag{3}$$

where $\prod_{i=-1}^{0}(P(g)U(x_i)) = I$, i.e. the $|Q|$-order identity matrix, $x_0 =$ '#' and $x_{n+1} =$ '\$'.

Similarly, the notion of "diagonal sum" is also applicable for multi-letter MM-QFAs.

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, Q_{rej,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu_i, \mathcal{O}_i)$ be k_i-letter MM-QFAs, $i = 1, 2$, where $k_i \geq 1$. The diagonal sum of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$, denoted by $\mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$, is a k-letter MM-QFA, given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2 \overset{\text{def}}{=} (Q, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej}, |\vartheta\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu_1 \oplus \mu_2, \mathcal{O})$$

where $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ with $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$, $Q_{acc} = Q_{acc,1} \cup Q_{acc,2}$, $Q_{rej} = Q_{rej,1} \cup Q_{rej,2}$, $|\vartheta\rangle$ is an arbitrary vector and $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_1 \oplus \mathcal{O}_2$[1]. Also, $\mu_1 \oplus \mu_2$ is given in the sense of Remark 2.1.

Remark 2.2. Note that, in Definitions 2.2 and 2.4, the initial state vector $|\vartheta\rangle$ is arbitrary. The following two unit vectors will play a key importance in the sequel.

$$|\rho\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |\psi_0^{(1)}\rangle \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad |\pi\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ |\psi_0^{(2)}\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

The aim here is to investigate the condition for the equivalence problems of multi-letter QFAs and multi-letter MM-QFAs. We first present the definition of "equivalence" for multi-letter QFAs and multi-letter MM-QFAs as follows.

Definition 2.5. Two multi-letter QFAs (multi-letter MM-QFAs) $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ over Σ are said to be equivalent (resp. t-equivalent) if $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ (resp. for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \leq t$).

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we study the equivalence problem of multi-letter QFAs. The following notations are needed.

---

[1] Here, if $\mathcal{O}_i = \{P_i(a), P_i(g), P_i(r)\}$, $i = 1, 2$, then $\mathcal{O}_1 \oplus \mathcal{O}_2 = \{P_1(a) \oplus P_2(a), P_1(g) \oplus P_2(g), P_1(r) \oplus P_2(r)\}$

Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, Q_{acc}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a k-letter QFA. For any $i \geq 0$, we let $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ denote the set $\{\overline{\mu}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu}(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, |\omega| \leq i\}$, $V_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ the vector space spanned by $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$. For any $i \geq k$, let $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ denote the set $\{\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, k \leq |\omega| \leq k+i\}$ where $\eta(\omega) = \mu(x_{n-k+1}\cdots x_n)\cdots\mu(x_2\cdots x_{k+1})\mu(x_1\cdots x_k)$, $S_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ the vector space spanned by $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$. Then, it is clear to see the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1), &\qquad V_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq V_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1) \\ K_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq K_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1), &\qquad S_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq S_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. Further, we remark that, if $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are k_i-letter QFAs over Σ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$, then we find that

$$\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_1}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,1}\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_1}}(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_2}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,2}\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}_2}}(\omega) \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

and

$$\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,1}\eta_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega) & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc,2}\eta_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Therefore, by the argument similar to Remark **7** in Ref. [31] we get that $\dim V_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$ and $\dim S_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$ for any i, where n_j, $j = 1, 2$, are the numbers of states in $\mathcal{A}_j$, respectively.

We now consider vector spaces $S_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$. For any $\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) \in K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$, let $y \in \Sigma$ be arbitrary. Observe that

$$\eta(yx_1\cdots x_n)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(yx_1\cdots x_n) =$$

$$\mu(yx_1\cdots x_{k-1})^\dagger \Big[\eta(x_1\cdots x_{k-1}x_k\cdots x_n)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(x_1\cdots x_{k-1}x_k\cdots x_n)\Big]\mu(yx_1\cdots x_{k-1}) \tag{7}$$

Remark 3.2. When k is restricted to be 1, then Eq. (7) degenerates to

$$\eta(y\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(y\omega) = \mu(y)^\dagger \left(\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\,\eta(\omega)\right)\mu(y) \tag{8}$$

which is used to deal with the equivalence for *quantum sequential machine*, attributed to Li and Qiu [26]. We can consider Eq. (7) as a generalization of Eq. (8).

Remark 3.3. Eq. (7) also implies that, if there exists an integer $l_{x_1\cdots x_{k-1}}$ such that, for any $x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega\in\Sigma^*$ with $|x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega|\geq l_{x_1\cdots x_{k-1}}$, the following Eq. (9) holds

$$\eta(x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega)=\sum_i a_i\Big(\eta(x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega_i)\Big) \quad (9)$$

with $|x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega_i|\leq l_{x_1\cdots x_{k-1}}$. Then, for any $x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\omega\in\Sigma^*$, Eq. (9) holds. Further, if for any $x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\in\Sigma^{k-1}$, there exists a common integer l such that Eq. (9) holds, then, for any $\omega\in\Sigma^*$ we have

$$\eta(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega) \quad = \quad \sum_i a_i\Big(\eta(\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\omega_i)\Big)$$

where $|\omega_i|\leq l$ and $a_i\in\mathbb{C}$. The most importance what we need to do is to find such an integer.

For any $\nu=x_1\cdots x_{k-1}\in\Sigma^{k-1}$ and $i\geq k$, we further let $K_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu,i)$ denote the set $\{\eta(\nu\omega)^\dagger P_{acc}\eta(\nu\omega)|\omega\in\Sigma^*,k\leq|\nu\omega|\leq k+i\}$, $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu,i)$ the vector space spanned by $K_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu,i)$. Then, inspired by the construction of "direct sum" in [5] attributed Qiu et al., we study the property of "Cartesian product" of $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu_1,i),\cdots,S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu_{|\Sigma|^{k-1}},i)$, i.e., $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu_1,i)\times\cdots\times S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu_{|\Sigma|^{k-1}},i)$. We first need the following

Proposition 3.1. *Let V_i, $i=1,2,\cdots n$, be a family of vector spaces over field $\mathbb{F}$. Let $V=V_1\times V_2\times\cdots\times V_n$. Then V is a vector space over $\mathbb{F}$ with respect to "+" and scalar multiply "·" of $\lambda\in\mathbb{F}$ given by*

$$\begin{aligned}(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n)+(\beta_1,\cdots,\beta_n) \quad &\triangleq \quad (\alpha_1+\beta_1,\cdots,\alpha_n+\beta_n)\\ \lambda\cdot(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n) \quad &\triangleq \quad (\lambda\alpha_1,\cdots,\lambda\alpha_n).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\dim V=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}\dim V_i$.

We show first the following

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $\Sigma=\{\sigma_1,\cdots,\sigma_{|\Sigma|}\}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_i=(Q_i,Q_{acc,i},|\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle,\Sigma,\mu_i)$, $i=1,2$, be k_i-letter QFAs over Σ and $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_1\oplus\mathcal{A}_2$. For all $i\geq 0$, define $\overline{S}(i)$ to be the Cartesian product: $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu_1,i)\times\cdots\times S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu_{|\Sigma|^{k-1}},i)$. Then*

- $\dim\overline{S}(i) = \sum\limits_{\nu\in\Sigma^{k-1}} \dim S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i) \leq (n_1^2+n_2^2)|\Sigma|^{k-1}$ *where* n_1 *and* n_2 *are the numbers of states in* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$*, respectively;*

- *There exist an integer* $l < (n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+1$ *such that* $\overline{S}(l) = \overline{S}(l+j)$ *for all* $j \geq 1$*, where* n_1 *and* n_2 *are the numbers of states in* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$*, respectively;*

- $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, l) = S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, l+j)$ *for all* $\nu \in \Sigma^{k-1}$ *and* $j \geq 1$*.*

Proof. The first part of clause 1 is implied by Proposition 3.1. For the second part of clause 1, by Remark 3.1, we see that $\dim S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i) \leq n_1^2 + n_2^2$ for all $\nu \in \Sigma^{k-1}$ and $i \geq 0$ (since $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i) \subseteq S_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$) and hence $\sum\limits_{\nu\in\Sigma^{k-1}} \dim S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i) \leq (n_1^2+n_2^2)|\Sigma|^{k-1}$.

The proof of clause 2 is similar to that of Lemma 6 in [31]. Suppose that there exits no such an integer. Then we see that $\overline{S}(i) \neq \overline{S}(i+1)$, which means that

$$\overline{S}(0) \subset \overline{S}(1) \subset \cdots \subset \overline{S}\Big((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+1\Big) \subset \cdots \subset \bigcup_{j\geq 0} \overline{S}(j)$$

By assumption, $\dim\overline{S}(0) \geq |\Sigma|^{k-1}$ ($\because \dim S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, 0) \geq 1$ for all $\nu \in \Sigma^{k-1}$), this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \dim\overline{S}\Big((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+1\Big) &\geq |\Sigma|^{k-1} + (n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+1 \\ &= (n_1^2+n_2^2)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+1 \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the fact that $\overline{S}\Big((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+1\Big) \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{j\geq 0} \overline{S}(j)$.

We process to show clause 3. Suppose that $\overline{S}(\nu_1, l) \neq \overline{S}(\nu_1, l+1)$. Then, there exists $\beta \in \overline{S}(\nu_1, l+1)$ with $\beta \notin \overline{S}(\nu_1, l)$, which implies that

$$\overline{S}(l+1) = \overline{S}(l) \not\ni (\beta, 0, \cdots, 0) \in \overline{S}(l+1),$$

which contradicts to clause 2. □

Remark 3.4. Also, we would like refer the reader to the proof of **Fitting's Lemma**, (cf. [28], p. 93; also [29], p. 155), which states that a group with operator set Ω satisfies two *chain conditions* of normal Ω-subgroup and φ is a normal Ω-endomorphism, then there exists an integer m such that $G = G^{\varphi^m} \times \operatorname{Ker}\varphi^m$. We may consider it as the inverse point of view. Here, $\overline{S}(i) \subseteq \overline{S}(i+1)$ together with Eq. (7) can be viewed as our "*proper chain condition*".

By virtue of Lemma 3.2, we prove the following

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, |\psi_0^{(i)}\rangle, \Sigma, \mu_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, *be* k_i*-letter QFAs. Let* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$*. Then* $V_{\mathcal{A}}\Big((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+k\Big) = V_{\mathcal{A}}\Big((n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+k+j\Big)$ *for all* $j \geq 1$*, where* $n_1 = |Q_1|$, $n_2 = |Q_2|$ *and* $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$.

Proof. For each $\nu = x_1 \cdots x_{k-1} \in \Sigma^{k-1}$, set $\varphi(\nu) = \mu(\Lambda x_1 \cdots x_{k-1}) \cdots \mu(\Lambda^{k-1} x_1)$. Then, for any $\omega = \nu x_k \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| = (n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k + j$ where $j \geq 1$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc} \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega) &= \Big(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)\varphi(\nu)\Big)^\dagger P_{acc}\Big(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)\varphi(\nu)\Big) \\
&= \varphi(\nu)^\dagger \Big(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc} \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)\Big)\varphi(\nu) \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 3.2, we have)} \\
&= \varphi(\nu)^\dagger \Big(\sum_i a_i \Big[\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc} \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu\omega_i)\Big]\Big)\varphi(\nu) \quad (|\nu\omega_i| \leq (n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k) \\
&= \sum_i a_i \Big(\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\nu\omega_i)^\dagger P_{acc} \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\nu\omega_i)\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc} \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega) \in V_{\mathcal{A}}\Big((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k\Big)$. The lemma follows. $\square$

We can now give the proof of Theorem 1.1 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First, we define that the vectors $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$, defined in Eqs. (4), are equivalence (resp. t-equivalence) with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ ($\triangleq \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$) if

$$\langle\rho|\Big(\overline{\eta_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc} \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)\Big)|\rho\rangle = \langle\pi|\Big(\overline{\eta_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)^\dagger P_{acc} \overline{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}}(\omega)\Big)|\pi\rangle$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ (resp. for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \leq t$). It is not hard to see that the above equation essentially implies that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ (resp. for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \leq t$).

Then, with Lemma 3.3, we can show that the vectors $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are equivalent with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if they are $(n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+k$-equivalent, which means that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)=\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Sigma^*$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)=\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Sigma^*$ with $|\omega|\leq(n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+k$, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent if and only if they are $(n_1^2+n_2^2-1)|\Sigma|^{k-1}+k$-equivalent (cf. the proofs of theorem 8 and theorem 1 in [31]). □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In [31], we have presented a much simpler approach to the equivalence problem of MM-1QFAs, which is generalized from [30], and is easier to follow than the one given in [25]. As a matter of fact, the equivalence problem for multi-letter MM-QFAs can be addressed similarly. The first step to achieve this is to transform the probability function of multi-letter MM-QFA $\mathcal{A}$ for accepting word ω, i.e., Eq. (3), to the following

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)\quad=\quad\begin{cases}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(x_1x_2\cdots x_n)-\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(x_1x_2\cdots x_{n-1}), & \omega=x_1x_2\cdots x_n;\\ \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(\epsilon), & \omega=\epsilon.\end{cases}\tag{10}$$

Then, the second step is to define the so-called "β-equivalence" (resp. "t-β-equivalence") for multi-letter MM-QFAs in terms of Eq. (10).

Definition 4.1. Two multi-letter MM-QFAs $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ over Σ are said to be β-equivalent (resp. t-β-equivalent) if $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)=\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Sigma^*$ (resp. for all $\omega\in\Sigma^*$ with $|\omega|\leq t$).

The following proposition states the relation between Definition 2.5 and Definition 4.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are two multi-letter MM-QFAs over Σ. Then $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent (resp. t-equivalent) iff they are β-equivalent (resp. t-β-equivalent).*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4 in [31]. We omit it here. □

Whereafter, by Proposition 4.1, what we need to do is to deal with the β-equivalence for multi-letter MM-QFAs.

Setting $A(x) = P(g)U(x)$ for any $x \in \Sigma \cup \{\#\}$ where $U(x_i)$ is defined in terms of Eq. (2), and noting that $P(a)^2 = P(a)$, $P(a)^\dagger = P(a)$, we expand Eq. (10), for future use, as follows.

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \quad = \quad \langle \psi_0 | \theta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) | \psi_0 \rangle$$

where $\theta(\omega)$ is given by

$$\theta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} \left(\prod_{i=n-1}^{0} A(x_i) \right)^\dagger \xi(x_n) \left(\prod_{i=n-1}^{0} A(x_i) \right), & \omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*; \\ U(\#)^\dagger P(a) U(\#) + A(\#)^\dagger U(\$)^\dagger P(a) U(\$) A(\#), & \omega = \epsilon. \end{cases}$$

where

$$\xi(x_n) \quad = \quad U(x_n)^\dagger P(a) U(x_n) + A(x_n)^\dagger U(\$)^\dagger P(a) U(\$) A(x_n) - U(\$)^\dagger P(a) U(\$).$$

Now, for any $\omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \geq k$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) \quad &= \quad (P(g)\mu(x_{n-k+1} \cdots x_n)) \cdots (P(g)\mu(x_2 \cdots x_{k+1}))(P(g)\mu(x_1 \cdots x_k)) \\ &= \quad (P(g)U(x_n)) \cdots (P(g)U(x_{k+1}))(P(g)U(x_k)) \\ &= \quad A(x_n) \cdots A(x_{k+1}) A(x_k). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, be k_i-letter MM-1QFAs over Σ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$. We use the following notations.

For any $i \geq 0$, we let $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ denote the set $\{\theta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) | \omega \in \Sigma^*, |\omega| \leq i\}$, $V_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ the vector space spanned by $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$, $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ the set $\{\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)^\dagger \xi(x_n) \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) | \omega = x_1 \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*, k \leq |\omega| \leq k + i\}$, $S_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$ the vector space spanned by $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i)$. Also, it is clear that $H_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq H_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$, and $K_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq K_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$ which imply that $V_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq V_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}}(i) \subseteq S_{\mathcal{A}}(i+1)$.

For any $\nu = x_1 \cdots x_{k-1} \in \Sigma^{k-1}$ and $i \geq 0$, let $K_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i)$ denote the set $\{\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu\omega)^\dagger \xi(x_n) \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu\omega) | \omega = x_k \cdots x_n \in \Sigma^*, k \leq |\nu\omega| \leq k + i\}$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i)$ the vector space spanned by $K_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, i)$.

We can now prove the following lemma which is similar to Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that* $\Sigma = \{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_{|\Sigma|}\}$*. Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, Q_{rej,i}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu_i, \mathcal{O}_i)$*,* $i = 1, 2$*, be* k_i*-letter MM-QFAs over* Σ*. Let* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$*. Then there exist an integer* $l < (n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + 1$*, where* n_1 *and* n_2 *are the numbers of states in* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_2$*, respectively, and* $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$*, such that* $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, l) = S_{\mathcal{A}}(\nu, l + j)$ *for all* $\nu \in \Sigma^{k-1}$ *and* $j \geq 1$*.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.2. $\square$

Now, we are able to show the following

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, Q_{rej,i}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu_i, \mathcal{O}_i)$*,* $i = 1, 2$*, be* k_i*-letter MM-QFAs over* Σ*. Let* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$*. Then* $V_{\mathcal{A}}\Big((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k\Big) = V_{\mathcal{A}}\Big((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k + j\Big)$ *for all* $j \geq 1$*, where* $n_i = |Q_i|$ *for* $i = 1, 2$*, and* $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$*.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3. $\square$

Definition 4.2. Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (Q_i, Q_{acc,i}, Q_{rej,i}, |\psi_0\rangle, \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}, \mu_i, \mathcal{O}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, be k_i-letter MM-QFAs over Σ. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$. Then, the vectors $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$, defined in Eqs. (4), are said to be equivalent (resp. t-equivalent) with respect to $\mathcal{A}$, if

$$\langle\rho|\theta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)|\rho\rangle = \langle\pi|\theta_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)|\pi\rangle \tag{11}$$

for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ (resp. for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$, with $|\omega| \leq t$).

Remark 4.1. It is not hard to see that the left of Eq. (11) is $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega)$ and the right of Eq. (11) is $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$.

Finally, we simplify the proof of Theorem 1.2 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. First, we can show that the vectors $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are equivalent with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if they are $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k$-equivalent with respect to $\mathcal{A}$.

Second, by Remark 4.1, we find that $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are equivalent with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ implies that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma^*$, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are β-equivalent. Also, $|\rho\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are t-equivalent with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ implies that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(\omega) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(\omega)$ for $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ with $|\omega| \leq t$, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are t-β-equivalent. The above observations show that k_1-letter MM-1QFA $\mathcal{A}_1$ and k_2-letter MM-QFA $\mathcal{A}_2$ are β-equivalent if and only if they are $\Big((n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k\Big)$-$\beta$-equivalent where $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$.

Lastly, by Proposition 4.1, we get $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are equivalent if and only if they are $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k$-equivalent. $\square$

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we first studied the equivalence problem for multi-letter QFAs, and then we studied the equivalence problem for multi-letter measure-many QFAs. More specifically, it has shown that k_i-letter QFAs $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are equivalent if and only if they are $(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1)|\Sigma|^{k-1} + k$-equivalent where n_i are the numbers of states in $\mathcal{A}_i$ and $k = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$. Further, we have shown a similar result for the equivalence problem of multi-letter measure-many quantum finite automata.

References

[1] M.A. Nielsen, I.L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[2] M. Hirvensalo, Quantum Computing, second ed., Springer, Berlin, 2004.

[3] J. Gruska, Quantum Computing, McGraw-Hill, London, 1999.

[4] D.W. Qiu, S. Yu, Hierarchy and equivalence of multi-letter quantum finite automata, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 410 (2009) 3006-3017.

[5] D.W. Qiu, L.Z. Li, et al., Multi-letter quantum finite automata: decidability of the equivalence and minimization of states, Acta Informatica 48 (2011) 271-290.

[6] A. Belovs, A. Rosmanis, et al., Multi-letter reversible and quantum finite automata, in: Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 4588, Springer, 2007, pp. 60-71.

[7] C. Moore, J.P. Crutchfield, Quantum automata and quantum grammars, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 237 (2000) 275-306.

[8] A. Kondacs, J. Watrous, On the power of quantum finite state automata, in: Proceedings of the 38th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1997, pp. 66-75.

[9] E. Bernstein, U. Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory, SIAM J. Comput. 26 (5) (1997) 1411-1473.

[10] A.C.-C. Yao, Quantum circuit complexity, in: Proceedings of the 34th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1993, pp. 352-361.

[11] M. Hirvensalo, Various aspects of finite quantum automata, in: Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 5257, Springer, 2008, pp. 21-33.

[12] M. Hirvensalo, Computing with quanta – impacts of quantum theory on computation, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 287 (2002) 267-298.

[13] M. Hirvensalo, Quantum automata with open time evolution, Int. J. Nat. Comput. Res. 1 (2010) 70-85.

[14] A. Brodsky, N. Pippenger, Characterizations of 1-way quantum finite automata, SIAM J. Comput. 31 (5), 1456-1478, 2002.

[15] A. Nayak, Optimal lower bounds for quantum automata and random access codes, in: Proceedings of the 40th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1999, pp. 369-376.

[16] A. Ambainis, R. Freivalds, One-way quantum finite automata: Strengths, weaknesses and generalizations, in: Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 1998, pp. 332-341.

[17] A. Ambainis, J. Watrous, Two-way finite automata with quantum and classical states, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 287 (2002) 299-311.

[18] J. Hromkovič, One-way multihead deterministic finite autoamta. Acta. Informatica 19, 1983, pp. 377-384.

[19] J.E. Hopcroft, J.D. Ullman, Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation, AddisonCWesley, New York, 1979.

[20] S. Eilenberg, Automata, Languages and Machines. Vol A, Academic Press, New York, 1974.

[21] H. Grigorian, S. Shoukourian, The equivalence problem of multidimensional multitape automata, J. Comput. System Sci. 74 (2008) 1131-1138.

[22] T. Harju, J. Karhumäki, The equivalence problem of multitape finite automata, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 78 (2) (1991) 347-355.

[23] A. Yakaryilmaz, A.C. Cem Say, Unbounded-eorror quantum computation with small space bounds, Inform. and Comput. 209 (2011) 873-892.

[24] L.Z. Li, D.W. Qiu, et al., Characterizations of one-way general quantum finite automata, Theorect. Comput. Sci. 419 (2012) 73-91.

[25] L.Z. Li, D.W. Qiu, Determining the equivalence for one-way quantum finite automata, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 403 (2008) 42-51.

[26] L.Z. Li, D.W. Qiu, Determination of equivalence between quantum sequential machines, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 358 (2006) 65-74.

[27] L.Z. Li, D.W. Qiu, A note on quantum sequential machines, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 410 (2009) 2529-2535.

[28] Ming-Yao Xu, Introduction to finite group, vol. I, (in chinese), Chinese Academic Press, Beijing, 1993.

[29] N. Jacobson, Lectures in abstract algebra (I. Basic Concepts), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975.

[30] J.W. Carlyle, Reduced forms for stochastic sequential machines, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 7 (1963) 167-175.

[31] T. Lin, Another approach to the equivalence of measure-many one-way quantum finite automata and its application, J. Comput. System Sci. 78 (2012) 807-821.